

proposed that PLATALEINAE Bonaparte, 1838, be retained, but that the Commission use its plenary powers to give THRESKIORNITHIDAE precedence as the name of the family. This would mean that the family would contain a subfamily based on an older name. Now this we *do* find confusing, as well as inconsistent, illogical, and unnecessary.

The law of priority is wonderfully simple and can be easily and immediately applied by any zoologist. Had priority been in effect earlier for the formation of family group names it would have prevented the unnecessary introduction of the names THRESKIORNITHIDAE and PLEGADIDAE in the first place. Just because there have been 'no adequate available synonymies for family-group names' of birds does not mean that sound nomenclatural rules should give way to poor scholarship. We particularly deplore the many recent *ad hoc* attempts by ornithologists to subvert various rules of nomenclature in order to preserve names that are judged in some quarters to be more familiar (see also Olson's comments in Wetmore *et al.*, 1984, p. 553).

In summary, it is our contention (a) that a case has *not* been made that the continued use of PLATALEIDAE as the family name for ibises and spoonbills would 'upset general usage' and (b) that the retention of the older name PLATALEINAE as a subgroup of the younger name THRESKIORNITHIDAE would result in an illogical and contradictory situation that could not and would not be adopted by conscientious and knowledgeable systematists. Therefore we strongly oppose the application of Eisenmann *et al.*, and we recommend that PLATALEIDAE be used as the family-level name for the ibises and spoonbills. If a subfamilial name be needed for typical ibises, it would probably be best to use the oldest available name, EUDOCIMINAE Bonaparte, 1854, so as not to clutter the literature with further applications and opinions.

REFERENCES

- AMERICAN ORNITHOLOGISTS' UNION. 1908. *The code of nomenclature adopted by the American Ornithologists' Union*. Revised edition lxxxv pp. New York.
- MACLEAN, G. 1985. *Roberts' birds of Southern Africa*. 5th ed. lii+848 pp. John Voelcker Bird Book Fund, Cape Town.
- PIZZEY, G. 1980. *A field guide to the birds of Australia*. 460 pp. Princeton, N.J.
- WETMORE, A., PASQUIER, R., & OLSON, S. L. 1984. Birds of the Republic of Panama. Part 4. vi+670 pp. *Smithsonian Misc. Coll.* 150(4).

FURTHER COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED CONSERVATION OF *SOUTHERNIA* ALLGEN, 1929 BY THE SUPPRESSION OF *SOUTHERNIA* FILIPJEV, 1927 (NEMATODA). Z.N.(S)940

By W. Grant Inglis (*Office of the Chief Scientific Adviser, GPO Box 1625, Adelaide, South Australia 5001*)

The former Secretary has resurrected part of a proposal made by Allgen in 1959 (*Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 17, pp. 86-88) on which I commented adversely in 1961 (vol. 18, p. 8). I still do so, some quarter of a century later. My previous opposition

was based on the principle that the problem, if it existed, could be solved by renaming rather than by action of the Commission. I still believe that this is a sensible and obvious solution to such minor problems. However, Gerlach & Riemann, 1974, *Veröff. Inst. Meeresforschung Bremerhaven* Suppl. vol. 4 (2), p. 552, rightly conclude that Filipjev's use of *Southernia* was a lapsus. Further, it has also been demonstrated that *Southernia* Allgen, 1929 is a junior subjective synonym of *Cyartoneura* Cobb, 1920, on what I consider very good grounds (see Juarion, J. V., 1973, *Veröff. Inst. Meeresforschung Bremerhaven* vol. 14, pp. 81–86). No action is, therefore, necessary by the Commission.

Note by R. V. Melville

I am grateful to Dr Inglis for pointing out that *Southernia* Allgen, 1929, is a subjectively invalid name. As a result, I wish to withdraw this application.

NOTES ON THE PROPOSED CONSERVATION OF *DAPSILARTHRA* FOERSTER, 1862. ZN(S.) 2312 (see vol. 41, pp. 53–55 and vol. 42, pp. 101–103)

By the Executive Secretary, International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature

Dr G. C. D. Griffiths has drawn attention to a printing error in his Comment on this case, and also to an oversight in the Commission office over the publication of a note by Mr R. V. Melville, then Secretary.

The first error refers to Dr Griffiths' comment in vol. 42, p. 101: the first generic name in para. 2, line 6 should (like the second) be spelt *Gnamptodon*, and not *Gnaptodon*.

A note by the Secretary had been discussed in correspondence between Dr Griffiths and Mr Melville, but unfortunately the agreed version was not that sent for printing. The note in vol. 42, p. 103 should be cancelled, and replaced by the following:

(4) Note by R. V. Melville

The Commission must clearly decide on the relative status of *Gnamptodon* Haliday, 1833 and *Gnaptodon* Haliday, 1837. Haliday used *Gnamptodon* in 1833, 1837 and 1840; he used *Gnaptodon* only once, in 1837. The Greek word *gnampto* means to bend or curve and relates to the shape of the mandible in these species; the Greek word *gnapto* may be either a variant spelling of *gnampto*, or a word meaning to comb or card wool (the preferred spelling is *knapto*). The expression 'combtooth' would have no relevance to an anatomical feature of these species. There is thus some evidence that *Gnaptodon* is indeed, as Dr Griffiths holds, a subsequent spelling (in my view, simply an erroneous one, without status in nomenclature) of *Gnamptodon*.